DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 330 382 JC 910 161

AUTHOR	Pluta, Katherine R.; Flachmann, Kim
TITLE	Building Bridges: Articulating Placement and Assessment Procedures in Writing Courses at BC and CSUB. Final Report. 1989-90 California Community College-California State University Joint Projects in English and Mathematics.
INSTITUTION	Bakersfield Coll., Calif.; California State Univ., Bakersfield.
PUB DATE	31 Aug 91
NOTE	35p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Articulation (Education); *College Transfer Students; Community Colleges; *Curriculum Development; Faculty Development; Higher Education; *Intercollegiate Cooperation; Participant Satisfaction; Program Content; Program Evaluation; *Teacher Workshops; *Transfer Programs; Universities
IDENTIFIERS	Bakersfield College CA; California State University Bakersfield

ABSTRACT

In an effort to improve communication between Bakersfield College (BC) and California State University at Bakersfield (CSUB) and prepare proposals for course and placement articulation agreements, a four-phase series of meetings, grading sessions, and workshops were held involving English, English as a Second Language (ESL), and Communications faculty from both institutions. The activities focussed on placement procedures, developmental English standards, freshman composition standards, proficiency standards, and ESL instruction. A writing consultant from Kern High School District also met regularly with the group. This final report of the project includes a schedule of the meetings held, a project expenditure summary, a copy of the proposed articulation agreements for writing courses at the two colleges, a report by the project consultant, an evaluation instrument developed by the consultant for use by the project directors, and a copy of a letter from the English department at BC voting unanimously to accept the criteria for English course articulation with CSUB. Outcomes of the project cited in the consultant's report include: (1) resolutions declaring course equivalencies have been or will be accepted by both institutions; (2) a course equivalency resource manual will be developed to be shared by local high school English department chairs, counselors, and entering students; (3) staff development, evidenced by the enthusiasm of participants, has been fostered; and (4) a demonstrated model of intercollegiate cooperation has been devised. (JMC)

ED330382

1989-90 California Community College - California State University Joint Projects in English and Mathematics

BUILDING BRIDGES: ARTICULATING PLACEMENT AND ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES IN WRITING COURSES AT BC AND CSUB

Final Report

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

K. R. Pluta

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Project Directors

Katherine R. Pluta
Bakersfield College

Kim Flachmann
California State University, Bakersfield

Submitted August 31, 1990

JC 910161

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Final Report

2. Expenditure Summary

3. Proposed Articulation Agreements

4. Consultant's Report

5. Evaluations by Phase

1. SUMMARY

We never dreamed we could accomplish as much as we did. It helped, of course, to have total support from our schools, but still, we were not sure how much response to expect from our colleagues. Years of mistrust had to be overcome.

We focused on key areas: assessment for placement, developmental standards, freshman composition standards, and proficiency standards for the two- and four-year degrees. Although not originally a part of the proposal, ESL became an ongoing topic of discussion as well. It almost sounds as if we expected standardization, and indeed, some feared a push in that direction. Instead, as we learned more about each other's programs, we developed a greater appreciation and respect for our differences. The goal of the project was not to duplicate one another's programs; we wanted to learn more about each other's programs so that we could develop formal articulation agreements.

For each of the phases of the project, we visited both campuses to become familiar with their procedures. We then met on "neutral ground" to discuss the information presented. As we became more comfortable with one another, our discussions took on a more substantive note, with both groups admitting difficulties we face in placing and assessing students at all levels.

We met eleven times: seven times at the campuses and four times on "neutral ground." At least 39 people participated in these sessions.

Participants filled out evaluation forms for each workshop and then completed a final evaluation of the entire project. All of these evaluations are included with this report. Over and over participants stressed the "comfortable atmosphere" and the

pleasure in getting to know one another. Relationships began to form as participants met at more than one session of the project. Future working relationships began to be established.

What some may have feared was an attempt to standardize our programs turned into an appreciation of our differences. We hope to continue these workshops on an annual basis. "Building Bridges: Part II" is planned for fall 1990.

Increased communication between Bakersfield College and California State University, Bakersfield, was not the only result of the project. A more tangible product will be the Resource Manual, which will include placement information for both campuses, including articulation agreements between schools. Course descriptions, outlines, sample syllabi, and assignments for all writing courses at both campuses will be the heart of the publication. This manual will be distributed not only to both CSUB and BC English faculty but also to key personnel at all the high schools in our common service area. The Resource Manual shares much of what we have learned about the programs with the high schools, so that they can inform and prepare their students. We have met regularly with our consultant, who directs the Writing Proficiency Program in the Kern High School District, and also with the High School English Department Chairs Council to ask for their suggestions on what information would be most helpful to them. We have received valuable feedback from both sources.

"Building Bridges" proved to be an apt title for the project, for we have indeed begun to build bridges of communication, understanding, and respect. These opportunities for professional growth were unparalleled in our region. Faculty benefited from the many discussions, and students will benefit both directly and indirectly from the improved communication between the campuses and the renewed enthusiasm of participants.

II. OBJECTIVES

The two schools are somewhat isolated regionally and need to work together to insure effective placement into and smooth transfer from one institution to the other. Unfortunately, this has not been the case in the past, due perhaps to misunderstandings. Because of this, the primary objective of the project was to open new and to improve old lines of communication between the two schools. Both schools were uninformed or even misinformed about each other's programs. So an additional objective was to learn more about the programs at several different levels, to share relevant documents, and to discover whether any agreements could be formally articulated. Any such agreements would simplify both the assessment process and the transfer process.

III. METHODS/IMPLEMENTATION

Staffing consisted of two faculty members, one from each school, with limited release time. Each school also employed one student assistant. Bev Banks, the consultant for the project, who directs the Kern High School District's Writing Proficiency Program, played an integral role in helping the project directors focus on particular issues to consider at each workshop. She read the evaluations from each of the sessions and the workshops (which she attended), using these comments to help direct the focus of future meetings. She also acted as a representative of the high school community, giving us important feedback about what the high schools needed from the two institutions of higher education.

Other than the campus copying machines to duplicate the many relevant documents we shared, we used no equipment.

Scheduling was one of the first and most important issues we dealt with as soon as we received the grant. With personal calendars in hand, the directors met frequently in January with each other, with campus representatives, and with department members to determine the best possible dates and times so that as many faculty as possible could participate. We chose Monday through Thursday afternoons for the campus sessions and Friday afternoons for the off-campus workshops. We scheduled two sessions for each phase, one at each campus to explain a particular process and to allow participation. A joint workshop then followed to explore issues which arose from the campus sessions. Additionally, representatives from both campuses made brief presentations regarding the focus of the workshop.

IV. QUANTITATIVE SUMMARY: SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS

DATE	TIME	TOPIC	PARTICIPANTS BC	PARTICIPANTS CSUB
PHASE 1		PLACEMENT		
W 2/7	2-4	BC Placement Essay Norming	7	9
W 2/14	2-4	EPT Placement Procedures	5	3
F 2/16	3-5	Placement Workshop	7	9
PHASE 2		DEVELOPMENTAL ENGLISH		
M 3/12	3:30-5:00	English 100 Qualifying Exam: Norming and Grading	8	3
W 4/4	2-4	English 60 Exit Exam: Norming	13	8
F 4/20	2-4	Developmental Standards Workshop	8	7
PHASE 3		FRESHMAN COMPOSITION		
M 2/26	1-5	CSUB Common Essay: Norming and Grading	9	7
F 3/2	3-5	Freshman Composition Workshop	12	14

PHASE 4/5 PROFICIENCY STANDARDS

T 3/13	1-5	Upper Division Writing Competency Exam: Norming and Grading	5	
W 4/25	2-4	BC Writing Competency Test: Norming	10	9
F 5/11	2-4	Proficiency Standards Workshop	11	11

Faculty from BC were members of the Modern Languages Division, specifically the English and ESL departments. Faculty from CSUB were members of the English and Communications Department, including English, ESL, and Communications.

Other activities included meetings of the two department chairs and the project directors; meetings of the department chairs, the project directors, and the consultant; meetings of the project directors and the consultant; and many meetings and telephone discussions of the project directors.

V. OUTCOMES/FINDINGS

The proposed formal articulation of placement standards and curriculum, a result of the project, will affect students directly by simplifying the processes for entering either institution and transferring from one institution to the other.

Also, faculty were given an opportunity for professional growth by learning more about each other's programs, goals, and concerns, all of which were very similar at the two schools. In addition, the grant participants expressed a desire for continuing the process by meeting again to discuss issues touched on during the project. Finally, faculty have suggested other subject areas for future meetings, such as the literature survey course taught at both schools.

Most importantly, both schools have used the project to reexamine their programs and to initiate further, in-house discussions.

Communication has also improved laterally on both campuses. The English department at BC has included the ESL department in its discussion of and voting on the proposed resolutions. Also, the BC Project Director has spoken to the President's Cabinet and to the Counseling Department--first as a means of explaining the project and then as a means of improving communication. Similar meetings have occurred on the CSUB campus, most particularly with the new Learning Disabilities Specialist.

The most important changes are the formal resolutions which articulate placement into and successful completion of courses at both campuses. These resolutions, once approved by both schools, will be shared with all departments, in the schools and with the feeder high schools. (See Section 3 for current draft of proposal.)

Another very important document will be the Resource Manual, which will be distributed to the English faculty at both campuses and to key personnel at all the feeder high schools. The manual will include the articulation agreements, explanations of the placement procedures at both schools, and documents such as course descriptions and syllabi which describe each institution's writing curriculum.

Additionally, on the recommendation of California State University, Bakersfield's Project Director, the Bakersfield College Project Director was invited to participate in the CSUB Upper Division Writing Competency Examination in Bakersfield and in the English Placement Test essay scoring in Berkeley this summer.

Finally, the improved lines of communication have led to a desire for more exchanges. The project directors plan to meet with representatives of the high schools to distribute the Resource Manual. Also, both directors have applied for campus funds to schedule a joint retreat in the fall to discuss common concerns.

VI. POST-PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

The articulation agreements will make placement and transfer easier for students at both institutions. The Resource Manual will document much of the information shared at the project meetings. It will make the information available to faculty who were unable to attend, to new and part-time faculty, and to high school faculty who need to know more about the programs their students will enter.

The project has also led to continuing evaluation of curriculum, for example the role reading plays in writing instruction and in testing writing proficiency.

VII. EXPENDITURE SUMMARY

See Section 2 of the Final Report.

VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

Implications: Our project provides a model to follow, particularly in two ways:

1. Scheduling of meetings: Visiting each campus regularly to learn about and participate in each other's processes, from methods of placement to methods of evaluating proficiency at specific levels and holding workshops at a site between the two campuses,

in a relaxed setting unconnected with either campus, proved to be very effective. These workshops were jointly chaired by the two directors, with presentations made by representatives from each campus, addressing the current topic. As a result, participants from both schools were equally involved and committed to the process.

2. The Resource Manual is a model document for both systems. It includes key materials from both campuses, explaining placement procedures and curriculum. It is very detailed and will be distributed to the faculty of both campuses and to our feeder high schools. The information it presents is straightforward and direct, addressing questions and concerns voiced at all three levels. It represents a level of openness never experienced in our academic community. It also serves to announce that the two campuses are working together.

Suggestions for continuing this project: This project needs to be encouraged to continue. If such efforts are not made, the communication could falter instead of thrive. Financial support, in terms of release time and honoraria, must continue.

Recommendations for future project directors:

1. Make sure the Director(s) have enough release time.

2. Include key people in all brainstorming and initial planning sessions (department chairs, division chairs).

3. Include many colleagues in planning and presentations so they feel more involved and committed.

4. Keep everyone, including non-participants, informed of developments through regular communication.

5. Recognize professional expertise by paying all presenters and participants.

6. Talk regularly to your counterpart at the other campus.

2. Expenditure Summary

1989-90
CCC-CSU JOINT FACULTY PROJECT
EXPENDITURE SUMMARY

COLLEGE/INSTITUTION: Kern Community College district
GRANT # 89-0730

	STATE FUNDS ALLOCATED	STATE FUNDS EXPENDED	IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS
PERSONNEL (Released Time)*			
Katherine Pluta (BC)	$1,672.00	$ 450.00	$4,892.00 *
Kim Flachmann (CSUB)	1,930.00	380.00	
Clerical Assistant	2,500.00	2,154.00	
Other (Specify) Consultant Fees	2,400.00	1,800.00	
Honoraria for Essay Readers	2,600.00	4,230.00	
SUBTOTAL, PERSONAL SERVICES	$11,102.00	9,014.48	4,892.00
OPERATING EXPENSES			
Supplies and Services			
Printing	1,500.00	598.43	
Travel	100.00		
Other (Specify)			
SUBTOTAL, SUPPLIES & SERVICES	1,600.00	598.43	
TOTAL STATE COSTS	$12,702.00	$9,612.91	$4,892.00

Signature: Katherine K Pluta
Project Director

*See next page.

*Note: Released time salary rates may not exceed those customarily used to release faculty at the institutions. Typically, such rates are limited to the Assistant Professor rank necessary to fund replacement faculty.

KERN COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

REQUEST FOR BOARD ACTION

CONTRACT ADJUSTMENT FOR CERTIFICATED PERSONNEL
(PAYROLL 01)

EMPLOYEE MOONEY, REBECCA LYNN (LAST / FIRST / MI) COLLEGE BAKERSFIELD

SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER 559-31-2200 SALARY CLASSIFICATION 111 (CLASS) 2 (STEP)

CONTRACT ADJUSTMENT

A. **EXTRA SERVICE(S):**

ADD _____ (TYPE OF EXTRA SERVICE) _____ (STIPEND) _____ (EFFECTIVE DATE)

DELETE _____ (TYPE OF EXTRA SERVICE) _____ (STIPEND) _____ (EFFECTIVE DATE)

B. **LEAVE OF ABSENCE:** _____ (TYPE OF LEAVE) _____ (EFFECTIVE DATE)

_____ (TERM—SEMESTER, ANNUAL, ETC) _____ (PERCENT OF CONTRACT)

(THIS FORM IS NOT USED FOR A SABBATICAL OR RETRAINING LEAVE REQUEST.)

C. **RESIGNATION:** _____ (EFFECTIVE DATE)

D. **RETIREMENT:** _____ (EFFECTIVE DATE) _____ (YEARS OF SERVICE)

E. **RECIND PREVIOUS ACTION:** _____ (PERSONNEL ACTION TO BE RECINDED)

_____ 1-18-90 (DATE BOARD APPROVED ORIGINAL ACTION)

F. **TERMS OF CONTRACT:**

INCREASE — FROM 53 % TO 86 % (PERCENT OF CONTRACT) January 10, 1990 (EFFECTIVE DATE)

DECREASE — FROM % TO % (PERCENT OF CONTRACT) _____ (EFFECTIVE DATE)

Changing from 53 to 86%. is $4892.00 more.

APPROVED	DATE
sDiane Krsor — COLLEGE PERSONNEL OFFICER	January 17, 1990
COLLEGE PRESIDENT/DESIGNATE	
VICE CHANCELLOR	
BOARD OF TRUSTEES	

Louise

Transfer will be coming from Roseles for 4.642.

11

3/1982
PRSNL

3. Proposed Articulation Agreements

1989-90 California Community College - California State University Joint Projects in English and Mathematics

BUILDING BRIDGES: ARTICULATING PLACEMENT AND ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES IN WRITING COURSES AT BC AND CSUB

DRAFT: PLACEMENT RESOLUTIONS

29 August 1990

Bakersfield College and California State University, Bakersfield, declare the following courses equivalent for placement and for transfer* from one institution to the other:

BC		CSUB
English 1A	=	English 110
English 1	=	English 100
English 60	=	English 51, 52, and 53 or one of these remedial courses and a passing score on the English 100 Qualifying Exam
ESL 1	=	Sheltered English 100
ESL 2	=	English 93
ESL 3	=	English 92
ESL 22	=	English 91

*Based on a grade in the course of C- or better.

4. Consultant's Report

EVALUATION REPORT FOR BUILDING BRIDGES: ARTICULATING PLACEMENT AND ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES IN WRITING COURSES AT BAKERSFIELD COLLEGE AND CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY BAKERSFIELD

Submitted by
Beverly Banks

Kern High School District
Kern/Eastern Sierra Writing Project
July 1990

One participant in BUILDING BRIDGES began a summary statement about the project by saying: " The chasm you seek to bridge is wide and deep." Historically, this statement could be confirmed, for earlier efforts between the English/Composition Departments at BC and CSUB have met with limited success. Over the years, culminating a three-institution (BC, CSUB, and KHSD) articulation conference in 1987-88, many attempts to coordinate programs have been attempted. As a result of my participation in meetings of KHSD English Department Chairs, I have seen repeated efforts by representatives from both BC and CSUB describing or explaining their placement procedures and promoting enrollment in their respective institutions. These sessions often resulted in frustration for high school teachers because there seemed to be no coordination between placement philosophies. English Department Chairs, as well as potential students, were expected to remember many separate sets of requirements and different types of examinations for both institutions.

Consequently, in January when I was approached and asked to serve as an evaluator, I greeted the project with measured skepticism. However, after working with BUILDING BRIDGES for six months and

seeing it evolve, I feel it offers genuine promise that new opportunities for cooperation will be found and students and faculty from all three institutions will benefit.

Early meetings between project directors and this evaluator were designed to accomplish two things: First, we wanted to discuss project activities and include high school articulation as possible and appropriate. Second, we were looking at the overall plan of the workshops and generating an evaluation process for this experimental project.

As part of the effort to include high school articulation, one original intent of the project directors was to explain the goals of BUILDING BRIDGES to Kern High School District English Department Chairs by attending their regularly scheduled February meeting. However, at a planning session, the Co-Directors and I abandoned the idea because the agenda was extremely full and there was no provision for real involvement of the high school teachers. Instead, we decided that since I would be attending the meeting, I could make a brief announcement, introducing KHSD English Department Chairs to project goals, followed by a short written explanation. This knowledge would prepare them for a later, more detailed session, when their ideas and expectations could be obtained for the development of the Resource Manual. The decision proved to be appropriate, because the May 27th

meeting of KHSD Department Chairs and Project Directors resulted in an enthusiastic exchange of ideas. High School teachers anticipate that the Resource Manual will benefit them, their schools, and most of all their students. We at the KHSD look forward, for the first time, to seeing and using one document which coordinates and explains clearly the placement requirements of both institutions.

The development and application of evaluation criteria for BUILDING BRIDGES extended for the full six months of the project. Co-Directors and I met numerous times to discuss the overall plan of the workshops and the goals of each faculty exchange session. We also met to review the evaluations generated in each summary workshop. We considered aspects of the project which might be evaluated. We discussed possible ways of articulating placement exams with high school proficiency standards. Also, we generated ideas for potential evaluation criteria.

In addition, English Department Chairs from both BC and CSUB met with us twice. At the first meeting, we reviewed together the experimental nature of the project and discussed evaluation procedures that might be reasonable or realistic. The Department Chairs were especially interested in curricular changes that might result from planned faculty exchanges and summary workshops.

Because this project was entirely new in concept and because I had previously had no experience in developing criteria for such a project, I gained many ideas from this meeting. Subsequently, I developed the first set of evaluation criteria. At the second meeting in late March, both Co-Directors and Department Chairs reviewed the suggested criteria carefully. Both department chairs stated that the criteria prompted them to investigate the way the project might affect curriculum, and they felt the criteria were organized in a way helpful to them.

As a result of later discussions with the Co-Directors, this initial set of criteria was revised (Attachment #1), largely by eliminating attempts to quantify data. Since there had been no way to administer pre-tests about faculty attitudes and since there were no data available on numbers of transfer students who might be affected by common placement exams, criteria such as these were deemed inappropriate and were either abandoned or redirected.

Discussions with project Co-Directors, meetings with Co-Directors and BC and CSUB English Department Chairs, personal participation in each of the summary workshops, and reviews of the evaluative comments made by participants have provided the sources for the following section of this report. In it, I have attempted to:

* review and analyze the evaluation sheets turned in by participants after each grading session and after each summary workshop
* draw conclusions about the project by comparing the statements made by participants with the evaluation criteria for that phase
* record observations made by this evaluator at each summary workshop and make comments on those observations
* consider and analyze the final evaluations from participants and make comments on the overall effectiveness of the project.

1. PHASE I - PLACEMENT AGREEMENTS

Evaluation criteria: Have placement agreements for entering students been articulated at both institutions?

It is obvious from the comments made by participants on the evaluation forms that participants enjoyed and learned from participating in grading sessions at each others' institutions. They were reassured that the reciprocal group's standards and rubrics were easy to understand and accept. They believed their basic assumptions about placement were similar. No one mentioned surprise or mis-alignment of expectations.

Several concerns surfaced. (1) The EPT session needed to be expanded to allow more time to be spent in actual grading of student essays and application of the rubric. (2) The BC placement session participants requested additional time be spent looking at specific texts and related course content.
(3) Participants in the summary workshop expressed new awareness of the needs of an expanding ESL/EFL student population and the way placement procedures addressed these students' needs.
(4) Also, participants mentioned heightened awareness of the differences created by semester or quarter course content and the differences in instructional programs for remedial and/or learning disabled students.

Observing the activities at the summary workshop, I gained an appreciation for the truly experimental nature of the project and the way the participants worked together. Even though the participants were not the same individuals in all summary workshops, a core of staff and the Co-Directors continued cooperation and friendly discussion. The placement workshop was typical of the good will and enthusiasm that existed in all subsequent meetings. The Co-Directors were sensitive to their established time-frame and kept discussion of placement issues moving ahead. Models of de-fusing tension with humor, the Co-Directors set the tone for accomplishment.

The fact that the summary workshop ended with formal resolutions for placement (Attachment #2), either already adopted (BC on May 11) or to be adopted (CSUB in the fall), is most significant. These resolutions came from thorough discussion and from the understandings of the other institution's policies. The resolutions will make transfers easier for students and will benefit entering students in the common service areas. These resolutions pay tribute to the careful organization of the project and the good will generated by the workshops. One of the participants summarized his/her feelings:

> The reason so much was accomplished was the commitment to cooperate shared by all participants.

Initially, neither Co-Directors nor participants could have predicted the spirit of cooperation generated by the placement sessions. Probably one reason for the good will is that under normal teaching circumstances, professors/instructors devote most of their time to students and less to discussion among colleagues of placement issues. Therefore, discussions about placement helped fill needs for individual professional development through opportunities to re-examine and refine personal philosophical beliefs about teaching. The resulting changes in policy, such as placement procedures, are concomitant with individual professional growth.

2. PHASE II: DEVELOPMENTAL STANDARDS

Evaluation Criteria: Have developmental standards (grading criteria) been clearly explained to the other institution?

Possibly because the sessions on developmental classes/exams came toward the end, when participants were well-acquainted or when they recognized and dealt more frankly with differences between their campuses and their respective student populations, this series of sessions produced more philosophical questions and led to more concerns. On their evaluations after the BC English 60 sessions, participants questioned the emphasis or the weighting of grades for mechanics against content. They also questioned the apparent leap that students must make between the successful completion of English 60 and the demands of the next course, English 1. Also mentioned were concerns about the course content for students who fail and must repeat English 60. After the CSUB Qualifying Exam sessions, participants suggested the possibility of analyzing common errors made by students and structuring course content to deal with the problems. Again, the difficulties faced by ESL/EFL students on both campuses were noted.

At the summary workshop, presenters offered historical information which helped both faculty groups understand the reasons for the types of exit exams at their sites. Discussion revealed that staff from both campuses felt reinforcement for their attempts to reach the less able or less academic student.

Some expressed surprise that developmental/remedial students on both campuses faced similar problems in composition classes and that the students themselves presented such similar characteristics. Again, earlier reciprocal grading sessions had provided participants with an understanding that articulation is not necessarily congruence and that for these levels/classes, a consensus of "agreeing to disagree" would be most appropriate.

Almost all participants mentioned the need to keep communication open between campuses. A repeated strand was the question of meeting the needs of ESL/EFL students. The evaluation criteria for this phase have been met with certainty. Because discussions in the workshop moved from explanation, to practice, to understanding and generalization about needs and commonalities, the participants demonstrated what they had learned about the reciprocal campus. In fact, so much information was shared that one participant exclaimed: "I feel so informed, I must pause to sort it all out!"

3. PHASE III: FRESHMAN COMPOSITION

Evaluation criteria: Have freshman course goals and grading standards been clearly explained to the other institution?

As a result of the CSUB Common Essay grading session, several participants mentioned that their feelings of shared standards

were reinforced and that they felt encouraged by discovering such similarities. Even requests for clarification of perceived discrepancies in the application of the grading standards did not dampen the camaraderie that developed. Housekeeping suggestions, such as requests for more copies of sample papers, appeared to be supportive and in the interest of getting on with the work rather than critical. One suggestion was made that BC consider adopting a similar assessment procedure.

The summary workshop for this phase was lively and exciting. An initial presentation concerning CSUB's library-lab course was received with interest. While BC also asks its students to become familiar with library practices and resources, their course is not yet a requirement. It appeared that BC would continue and possibly expand their library requirement as a result of this interchange. The presentation on course content at BC focused on the amount of writing required and the specific texts used, providing a clear picture of what is expected of students. Participants brought sample lessons to share, which explained, on a very practical level, the course content/goals at both institutions. As teachers presented their assignments, they explained how the assignments fit into the total course as well as their objectives for including them. Many mentioned the value of this part of the workshop, both for increasing their own teaching repertoires and for understanding the course and grade

expectations on the reciprocal campus. Several suggested that such a sharing of instructional strategies might become an annual or semester event within their own departments in addition to sharing with the other campus. By including this aspect of the session, the Co-Directors demonstrated the adoption of an effective staff development strategy, originated and proved by the California Writing Projects. That the strategy worked successfully with this group is a comment on the creative organization of the project and the openness of the participants.

4. PHASES IV AND V: PROFICIENCY STANDARDS

Evaluation Criteria: Have lower division exit exams (or the process) been clearly explained to the other institution? (Writing Competency Test at BC)

Evaluation Criteria: Have upper division proficiency standards been clearly explained to the other institution? (Upper Division Writing Competency Test at CSUB)

Evaluations from the grading session of Phase IV (BC) brought out additional respect for members of the reciprocal faculty. Several mentioned the skill of the presenter and the congeniality of the group. There were few questions about the appropriateness of the test, although overlapping criteria and the relative importance of mechanics and content were mentioned. The use of holistic scoring rather than primary trait was suggested by one participant. The paradox of how students could meet the competency requirement and still write with many errors was acknowledged. Teachers were sensitive to the dilemmas between

compromising competency and certifying learning disabled students.

Evaluations from the Phase V (CSUB) sessions focused on commonalities among raters. Most perceived that rater reliability was high. One participant expressed exactly the purpose of organizing the project so that faculty could take part in the grading sessions:

> I have a better perspective of where my BC English 1A students are headed and what I need to do as a 1A instructor.

Large attendance marked the culminating proficiency workshop. While discussion focused on problems inherent in defining or certifying proficiency at both upper division and lower division levels, many topics were introduced and reconsidered. Specific testing issues included the development of common topic banks,the advisability of tying reading tasks to writing tasks, dyslexia, and other learning handicaps. Some participants reiterated problems related to any type of single-event testing. Others eventually moved toward discussion of items that they felt could be included in future meetings between department members. Many used the proficiency workshop evaluations to comment favorably on the entire project. Almost all made special mention of the openness and frankness of communication which the sessions had fostered, and all anticipated continuing this kind of

communication in the future.

SUMMARY:

While exceptional work has been started by this project, some questions remain for future activities. Although the seeds have been planted for many significant curricular changes, there will need to be continued nurturing in order to see fruition. The Co-Directors of this project would be the logical leaders in facilitating curricular change. This evaluator hopes that some means may be found to continue their leadership.

Additionally, given the high level of enthusiasm expressed by participants, one might expect continuation of periodic exchanges between departments. In fact, there has been some additional voluntary exchange, as some participants have met at CSUB or informal "Friday Afternoon" discussions. However, if funds providing individual stipends are unavailable for the future, it seems unlikely that the degree of participation/involvement can be maintained.

After considering the modified evaluation criteria for each phase

and the participants' reactions to the workshops, I feel the overall success of the BUILDING BRIDGES project has been established. For particular recognition, I would cite the following:

1. Resolutions declaring equivalencies have been (or will be) accepted by both institutions.(Attachment #2)
2. A Resource Manual will be developed to be shared with local high school English Department Chairs, Counselors, and entering students.
3. Staff development, evidenced by the enthusiasm generated for continuing communication between departments, has been fostered by this project.
4. A model of cooperative effort between two local and very different institutions of higher learning has been devised.

This project has resolved numerous historical conflicts and has pointed the way for future development of strong academic ties between the institutions. This breakthrough would not have been possible without the determination and the dedication that the capable Co-Directors brought to the project.

While one participant began an evaluation statement by pointing out difficulties from the past, the remainer of the cogent comment summarized the feelings of many.

> The chasm you seek to bridge is wide and deep.
> But some preliminary construction, no matter
> how fragile, is certainly worth attempting.

This evaluator agrees. BUILDING BRIDGES has definitely been worth the attempt.

Attachment #1

1989-90 California Community College - California State University
Joint Projects in English and Mathematics

BUILDING BRIDGES: ARTICULATING PLACEMENT AND ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES IN WRITING COURSES AT BC AND CSUB

EVALUATION CRITERIA

1. Have placement agreements for entering students been articulated at both institutions?

2. Have developmental standards (grading criteria) been clearly explained to the other institution?

3. Have freshman course goals and grading standards been clearly explained to the other institution?

4. Have lower-division exit exams (or the process) been clearly explained to the other institution?

5. Have upper-division proficiency standards been clearly explained to the other institution?

Answering each of these five questions in sequence might be considered the "formative" evaluation for each phase of the project.

C. If course goals and grading standards are articulated, can we predict greater numbers of student transfers between institutions? Can these anticipated transfers be documented by some means?

IV. PHASE IV: Have lower-division exit exams (or the process) been clearly explained to the other institution?

A. Do participants understand the standards used for evaluating the WCT at BC?

B. Could a sample set of WCT exams from BC be used to norm the CSUB faculty participants?

V. PHASE V: Have upper-division proficiency standards been clearly explained to the other institution?

A. Do workshop participants understand the proficiency standards of the reciprocal institution?

B. Will the "topic bank" developed in the workshops be available to both institutions?

1. Will faculty, students, or others have access to the topic bank?

2. Will the "topic bank" be published for review?

C. How are these proficiency standards related to the local high school proficiency standards? Is there a logical progression of difficulty from twelfth, through fourteenth, to sixteenth years?

VI. GENERAL EVALUATION:

A. When will the various publications of the project be available for review?

1. What is the plan for dissemination of the publications?

B. How are the evaluation forms completed by participants being used by Project Directors?

1. Are presenters given feed-back on their evaluations?

2. What adjustments have the Directors made in the project based on participants' suggestions?

I. PHASE I: Have placement agreements for entering students been articulated at both institutions?

A. Placement agreements articulated in the project workshops should be available for review by:

1. Project Directors
2. Project Participants
3. Department members who have not participated in the workshops
4. Evaluator

B. What process is being used at each institution to introduce all department members with the articulated placement agreements?

C. How will these agreements be adopted by both departments/schools/divisions?

D. Have any of the agreements been modified by the respective total departments?

II. PHASE II: Have developmental standards (grading criteria) been clearly explained to the other institution?

A. As a result of participating in each other's grading workshops, do instructors understand methods used at the reciprocal institution?

B. Where developmental standards differ, could participants explain the reasons for the differences and the accommodations students would need to make?

C. How will records of student accomplishment be transferred between institutions (QE, ET, BC Placement)?

III. PHASE III: Have freshman course goals and grading standards been clearly explained to the other institution?

A. Could workshop participants describe freshman course goals and grading standards at the reciprocal institution?

B. Have there been changes in course goals or grading standards at either institution as a result of the workshops in this phase?

1. For example, has participation in the workshops encouraged BC instructors to adopt a "Common Essay" as CSUB has?

2. What could be expected as an outcome if BC does this?

3. Has CSUB adopted any practices from BC's goals or grading practices for freshman courses?

As I view the project from a strictly outsider's point of view, I see some additional unstated purposes.

(1) to change/develop curriculum

(2) to develop better working relations between the schools

(3) to produce a model of cooperation that could be adopted or replicated by other community colleges and state universities

FURTHER EVALUATION PROCESSES

I. Curriculum: Will there be catalog/announcement changes that reflect adjustments or revision in course content? When?

II. Staff Development:

A. Could changes in staff be documented by a pre-post survey?

B. Are plans for team-teaching or exchange teaching underway?

C. What follow-up workshops are planned? How will they be funded? Who will attend?

III. Replication:

A. Are grants available to other institutions that might be interested in carrying out similar cooperative projects?

B. Is there a demonstrated need for other projects of this type?

1989-90 California Community College - California State University
Joint Projects in English and Mathematics

BUILDING BRIDGES: ARTICULATING PLACEMENT AND ASSESSMENT
PROCEDURES IN WRITING COURSES AT BC AND CSUB

11 May 1990

On May 9, 1990, the English Department of Bakersfield College voted unanimously to accept the following resolution:

Bakersfield College and California State University, Bakersfield, declare the following equivalencies for placement into and successful completion of these courses with a C- or better:

BC		CSUB
English 1A	=	English 110
English 1	=	English 100
English 60	=	*English 51, 52, and 53
ESL 1	=	sheltered English 100
ESL 2	=	English 92 and 93

*Students who place at the English 51, 52, and 53 or 91, 92, and 93 level at CSUB must do one of the following to be eligible for English 1:

1. Complete all three courses with a C- or better.
2. Complete at least one course and pass the QE (Qualifying Exam).

The English department also voted unanimously, pending consultation with and approval by Bob Carlisle, to support the following change proposed by Judy Garrett:

ESL 3	=	English 91 and 92
ESL 22	=	no equivalent

Implementation of the joint resolution will depend on approval by the English and Communication Department of California State University, Bakersfield. The resolution would then go through all of the appropriate channels at both schools before being fully approved.

Kate Pluta

Kate Pluta

cc: Don Stansbury
Jeffry Spencer
Kim Flachmann
Judy Garrett
Bob Carlisle
Bev Banks

ERIC Clearinghouse for
Junior Colleges
May 17, 1991